

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Bahaadur Abdulahad, and)	
Jennifer McManus,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
vs.)	Civil Action No.:4:06-2642-TLW-TER
)	
Chesterfield County Sheriff's Department,)	
et al,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

ORDER

Plaintiffs, Bahaadur Abdulahad and Jennifer McManus, (“plaintiffs”) brought this action, *pro se*, under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, on September 25, 2006. (Doc. #1).

This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, to whom this case had previously been assigned. (Doc. #116). In the Report, Magistrate Judge Rogers recommends that the District Court grant defendants’ motion for summary judgment (Doc. #76) and deny the plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment (Doc. #61). (Doc. #116). The plaintiffs filed objections to the report. (Doc. #128). In conducting this review, the Court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections...The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Housing Auth. of the City of Columbia, 791 F. Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992)
(citations omitted).

In light of the standard set forth in Wallace, the Court has reviewed the Report and the objections. After careful review of the Report and objections thereto, the Court **ACCEPTS** the Report. (Doc. #116). Therefore, for the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the defendants' motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED** (Doc. #76) and the plaintiffs' motion summary judgment is **DENIED**. (Doc. #61).¹

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Terry L. Wooten

Terry L. Wooten
United States District Judge

September 25, 2008

Florence, South Carolina

¹The plaintiffs have also filed a motion to amend the complaint. (Doc. #128). While Rule 15 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure allows for amendment at any time during the case, the Court **denies** the motion. The action has been ongoing for two years. At this point in the litigation, it would prejudice the defendants to allow a second amendment of the complaint.